

REMARKS

Interview with Examiner

Applicants thank the Examiner for her courtesy and that of her supervisor extended to Applicants' representative during the telephonic interview on March 30, 2010. During the interview, Applicants' representative discussed with the Examiner differences between the claims and the cited references, as detailed in the Amendment filed with an RCE on March 15, 2010. Based on the interview, the Examiner indicated that she would expect a Supplemental Amendment before proceeding with examination of the claims after the RCE filed on March 15, 2010. *See* Interview Summary form PTOL-413. Accordingly, Applicants file this Supplemental Amendment for the Examiner's consideration, and request entry of the proposed amendments.

Supplemental Amendment

Applicants propose amending independent claims 27, 29, 34, 35, 37, 43, 44, 46-48, and 50-52 to improve clarity. Amended independent claim 27 recites, among other things, the following features (similarly recited in independent claims 34, 35, 43, 44, and 50):

- subjecting such respective measurements to state-based statistical filtering, said state-based statistical filtering comprising:

- selecting at least part of said set reference elements as terrestrial reference elements;

- providing at least one first state representative of said at least one location coordinate;

- providing at least one further state in addition to said at least one first state, said at least one further state being representative of said measurement errors having non-zero mean; and

performing said state-based statistical filtering on said respective measurements, using said at least one first state and said at least one further state in said state-based statistical filtering to determine said at least one location coordinate of said mobile terminal.

Support for the amendments to independent claims 27, 34, 35, 43, 44, and 50 can be found in the specification at, for example, p. 8, lines 5-20.

For at least the reasons discussed in the Amendment filed March 15, 2010, Riley, Phelts, McBurney, and Hoshino, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above features. For example, the cited references do not teach or suggest, among other things, “providing at least one further state in addition to said at least one first state, said at least one further state being representative of said measurement errors having non-zero mean,” as recited in amended claim 27. Furthermore, the cited references do not teach or suggest “performing said state-based statistical filtering on said respective measurements, using said at least one first state and said at least one further state in said state-based statistical filtering to determine said at least one location coordinate of said mobile terminal,” as recited in amended claim 27. Claims 27, 34, 35, 43, 44, and 50 are therefore nonobvious.

Accordingly, independent claims 27, 34, 35, 43, 44, and 50 should be allowable over the cited references. Dependent claims 28-33, 36-42, 45-49, 51, and 52 also should be allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependence from base claims 27, 34, 35, 43, 44, or 50, and because they recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Applicants therefore respectfully request entry of this Supplemental Amendment, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections, and allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 9, 2010

By: 

David M. Longo
Reg. No. 53,235

/direct telephone: (571) 203-2763/